IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 17-0520 Filed June 7, 2017

IN THE INTEREST OF C.C., Minor Child,

W.C., Mother, Appellant.

Appeal from the lowe District Court for Clinton County Phillip I. Tabor

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Clinton County, Phillip J. Tabor, District Associate Judge.

Mother appeals from a dispositional review order. **AFFIRMED.**

J. David Zimmerman, Clinton, for appellant mother.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, and Mary A. Triick, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee State.

Brian P. Donnelly of Mayer, Lonergan & Rolfes, Clinton, guardian ad litem for minor child.

Considered by Vogel, P.J., and Doyle and McDonald, JJ. Tabor, J., takes no part.

MCDONALD, Judge.

A mother challenges a dispositional review order continuing the out-of-home placement of her child, C.C. We affirm.

The child was initially removed from the mother's care in September 2016. See *In re C.C.*, No. 16-1678, 2017 WL 104969, at *1–2 (lowa Ct. App. Jan. 11, 2017). A subsequent review hearing was held in March 2017. The department of human services recommended the child remain in the out-of-home placement. In response, counsel for the mother asserted, "[The mother] would very much like to have [C.C.] back home. However, she realizes that he's doing well and would support the recommendations in the case plan." The mother presented no evidence. At the conclusion of the hearing, the court stated it understood continuing the placement "is not what Mom wants" but determined doing so was in the child's best interest and ordered the existing placement to continue. The mother now challenges that determination.

The State argues the mother has not preserved error. We agree. *See In re K.R.*, No. 16-1129, 2016 WL 4803911, at *2 (lowa Ct. App. Sept. 14, 2016) (finding insufficient to preserve error father's statement he "would like to see" the children come home "[i]n the future . . . but not today"). The mother "support[ed] the recommendations" and did not present any evidence or otherwise challenge the continuing placement. Error was not preserved. *See In re T.J.O.*, 527 N.W.2d 417, 420 (lowa Ct. App. 1994) ("As a general rule, an issue not presented in the juvenile court may not be raised for the first time on appeal.").

AFFIRMED.